

# Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Panel (Keighley & Shipley) held on Wednesday 27 January 2016 in the Council Chamber, Keighley Town Hall

---

Commenced 1000  
Adjourned 1025  
Re-convened 1035  
Adjourned 1115  
Re-convened 1122  
Concluded 1203

**PRESENT – Councillors**

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	INDEPENDENTS
M Pollard	Shabir Hussain (Chair)	Naylor
Sykes	Abid Hussain (DCh)	
	Bacon	
	Farley	

Observers: Councillor M Smith (Minute 45) and Councillor M Slater (Minute 49).

**Councillor Shabir Hussain in the Chair**

**41. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

No disclosures of interest in matters under consideration were received.

**42. MINUTES**

**Resolved -**

**That the minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2015 be signed as a correct record.**

**43. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS**

There were no appeals submitted by the public to review decisions to restrict documents.

**44. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

There were no questions submitted by the public.



45. **52 WHEATLEY LANE, ILKLEY**

**Ilkley**

Full application for the construction of a two bedroomed dwelling with associated parking at 52 Wheatley Lane, Ilkley –15/04643/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that Ilkley Parish Council had recommended refusal of this application stating that the site was in a Conservation Area and it would be out of character with the surrounding buildings. Letters/emails of comment had been received from three separate addresses, one in support and two objecting to the proposal. One objection was from a Ward Councillor and the other from the Ilkley Civic Society. The Councillor had requested referral to the Panel should officers be minded to support the proposal. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document “K”.

The proposed development was considered to relate satisfactorily with the existing street scene and was not considered to result in any significant loss of residential amenity or significant harm to highway safety or the conservation area or setting of the nearby listed building. The proposal was considered to comply with Policies BH4A, BH7, UR3, D1, TM2, TM12 and TM19A. of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. He therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

A Ward Councillor was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- It was a small site.
- The garden of 52 Wheatley Lane and the new house was overlooked by the railway bridge.
- The site was adjacent to a right of way.
- I am surprised that building consent was not needed.
- Cars back onto the highway and it was a difficult spot.
- It was a narrow road.
- The development was unsuitable.
- The Parish Council and Ilkley Civic Society had objected.
- It was an unsustainable site.
- Local objections and common sense had been ignored

Members made the following comments:

- The Conservation Team had withdrawn an objection but it was not withdrawn on the website.
- Were they formally permitted parking slots?
- The letter says they need listed building consent.
- Network Rail was now happy.
- The building looks odd it doesn't look like it would fit in.
- It seems slightly incongruous.
- The letter was misleading.
- The Conservation Officer change should have been reflected on the website.
- I have looked at the parking situation at the railway station. It was ridiculous there was no turning into the parking area. It would clog up the whole area.
- If the house was to be sold on there was no garden. I would not want to live in it or buy it as there would be noise from trains.
- I don't have any objections.
- You don't have to buy the property.



The applicant's agent was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- We discounted the permitted development.
- The conservation issues were resolved.
- In respect of highways the existing access would be maintained.
- We withdrew the original application to address Network Rail issues.
- I hope you approve the application.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration responded to members' comments and made the following points.

- They are formally permitted parking slots.
- You need consent to demolish a listed building.
- The windows would be removed on the back wall facing the railway bridge.
- We are happy with the building.
- The layout was typical of a traditional driveway. You can reverse out of and into the driveway.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration's technical report.**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration***

**46. HOYLE COURT PRIMARY SCHOOL, FYFE GROVE, BILDON**

**Bildon**

Application for advertisement consent (retrospective) for the display of a free-standing non-illuminated school sign at Hoyle Court Primary School, Fyfe Grove, Bildon – 15/06897/ADV.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that three written objections and a petition had been received objecting to the application. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document "K". He recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

**Resolved –**

**That advertisement consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration's technical report.**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration***

**47. SUNWAYS, OTLEY ROAD, ELDWICK, BINGLEY**

**Bingley**

Householder application for a proposed two storey extension and attached garage to the rear of Sunways, Otley Road, Eldwick, Bingley – 15/06922/HOU.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that no representations had been received. He therefore recommended approval of the application.

**Resolved –**



**That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Strategic Director, Regeneration's technical report.**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration***

48. **17 ARCTIC STREET, KEIGHLEY**

**Keighley Central**

Full application for change of use of dwelling to six bedsits. 17 Arctic Street, Keighley – 15/01209/FUL.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that nine objectors responded to the publicity for the application. The summary of representations was as outlined in Document "K".

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the introduction of 6 bedsit flats would significantly intensify the use of the property and result in additional demand for on-street car parking in an area that already contained a high density of residential occupancy but no off-street parking facilities. In these circumstances it was considered likely that additional parking pressure would lead to difficulties and loss of amenity for existing residents and to conflicts arising due to the demand for the limited parking space available. As such the proposals fail to satisfy Policies TM12, UR3 and D1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

The proposals would result in the formation of six separate residential flats within the property, but make no provision for the storage or collection of waste bin and recycling bins on land within the applicant's control. The storage of additional numbers of bins within the confined rear communal garden area would result in harm to the amenities of nearby neighbouring residents. Lack of provision for storage and collection of waste and recycling bins that would arise from the intensification of the residential use would be contrary to Policies D1 and UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. He therefore recommended refusal of the application.

Members made the following comments:

- Was it illegal to park on the cycleway?
- Was the property unoccupied?
- Bins can be shared and stored.
- There was no bin storage internally.
- How many bins would there be?
- Who owns the open space behind the property?
- There was no indication of ownership or if the area was commonly managed by residents. It was an effective free for all.
- There were design changes. At what stage would it become a separate plan?
- There was no environmental report in respect of the bin issue.
- It doesn't exceed capacity of local infrastructure.
- People would usually have their bins outside.
- There would be six flats for six people this was not increasing the usage of the property.
- I am not sure the reasons for refusal are sustainable.
- I don't have any problems as the bins are at the other end. I recommend approval of the application.



The applicant's agent was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- What was proposed was to have a range of housing in a particular location to reflect local demand.
- Residents in the bedsits would be single people on minimum wages or on benefit.
- The properties would be refurbished properly.
- There would be space for rubbish bins.
- The tenants of the property would be unlikely to have cars and would have access to buses.
- The map shows a yard area to accommodate bins.
- There would be no highway safety implications as nothing had changed.
- There was adequate off street parking space available.
- There was a communal area and when the drains were blocked only the applicant dealt with the problem.
- £60,000 was spent on installing new kitchens.
- Investment in this kind of property should be welcomed.
- There was room for cars and wheelie bins.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration responded to members' comments and made the following points.

- If you park on the cycleway you may be open to prosecution for obstruction.
- Yes the property was unoccupied.
- The open space behind the property was shared and there was no indication that the applicant owned it.
- The grass was being cut and there were various ownerships.
- The design changes were approved by building control. It was a building control rather than a planning matter.
- There was a requirement for bins in residential areas and for recycling.
- It was a habit to leave bins on the road.

**Resolved –**

**That planning permission be granted for the following reason:**

**That the need for the accommodation is judged, on balance, to outweigh any harm to local amenity that might arise due to additional parking or waste bin storage.**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration***

49. **DIMPLES FARM, STREET LANE, EAST MORTON, KEIGHLEY**

**Keighley East**

Construction of single storey side extension, alterations to porch and glazed canopy over existing terrace at Dimples Farm, Street Lane, East Morton – 15/02827/HOU.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration gave a presentation setting out the proposals and tabled plans detailing the layout in respect of the application. He reported that no representations had been received but a petition was received seeking referral to Panel.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration reported that the proposed canopy would, by reason of its size, design and location across the full width of the dwelling, create an alien and incongruous feature which would detract from the simple rustic character of this country cottage and would



harm the character of its Green Belt surroundings. The proposal was therefore considered to be contrary to Policy D1, UR3 and GB5 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan. He therefore recommended refusal of the application.

A Ward Councillor was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- On page 28 of the report the red line should extend further south. It was 200 yards from the footpath.
- The land was large and local farmer's cattle were allowed to graze rent free.
- On the eastern boundary there were four dwellings.
- On Page 29 of the officer report in respect of site history it mentions a cottage but this should refer instead to the farmhouse.
- The more substantive matter was the canopy.
- There were no problems with the eastern extension.
- It was all about the canopy which had a glazed roof and was not in any way obtrusive.
- The canopy was essential to meet the needs of the applicant who has a medical condition. He needs to get out of his car to his front door undercover.
- In respect of the reason for refusal the canopy was not along the full width of the farmhouse.

The applicant was present at the meeting and made the following points:

- It was a farmhouse not a holiday let or a cottage.
- There were objections to the canopy but it would stop where the farmhouse becomes attached to the barn.
- The architect has shown the canopy going further onto the barn or to stop short and go onto another bay.
- There was a need for a structural engineer to look at the canopy.
- Where 19 metres was mentioned it should be 17.5 metres which was not a big reduction.
- There was a 2.4 metres extension away from the wall.
- With a wheelchair I need to go from inside to the outside of the building. I need to be allowed to be loaded to the new extension, to be able to drive in and reverse out.
- The canopy which was a slim metal frame was grey in colour and was not obtrusive or unsympathetic and would be hardly noticeable.
- Walkers may see us sometimes.
- I have discussed solutions with the architect.
- The overall length of the reduction was 2.7 metres.
- There would be better weather protection.
- I can provide more details of my medical history.
- There was a clear distinction between the farmhouse and the barn.

Members made the following comments:

- How visible was the proposed development and who might it upset?
- The diagram could be incorrect there could be a shorter canopy.
- Would it be much more incongruous?
- There was a disability issue here and if it helps someone then I am for it.
- You could have stone pillars and a slate roof.
- I appreciate the picture of the driveway port. It was not obtrusive.
- I am happy with the use of glass.
- I understand the reasoning for the canopy. Making it stone or slate would make it more obtrusive.
- I support officer protection of the Green Belt and am minded to approve subject to use of



stone pillars with glass left as proposed and with final design agreed with officers under delegated powers.

The applicant responded that he was happy with a stone pillar but not a slate roof as he would lose light.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration responded to members' comments and made the following points.

- The canopy looks odd and would have an effect on a traditional building.
- It was in the Green Belt. There were public footpaths lower down in the fields.
- A heavier structure was possible.

#### **Resolved –**

**That subject to the Strategic Director, Regeneration securing an amendment to the drawings to show natural stone to be incorporated to the canopy supports, and for the length of the canopy to be reduced to coincide only with the width of the dwelling he be delegated authority to grant the application for the following reason:**

**The extension is acceptable and permission is granted for the canopy due to the personal circumstances of the applicant which, together with the lack of prominence, are deemed to outweigh any harm to the character of the building and its Green Belt setting.**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration***

#### **50. REQUESTS FOR ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTION ACTION**

(i) **92 Highfield Lane, Keighley**

**Keighley Central**

Construction of white UPVC clad dormer window to the front elevation of the property – 14/00080/ENFUNA.

The dormer window was considered to be significantly detrimental to the visual amenity of the existing property and wider surrounding area. The Planning Manager (Enforcement and Trees) therefore authorised the issuing of an Enforcement Notice under delegated powers, on 11 January 2016.

#### **Resolved –**

**That the report be noted.**

***NO ACTION***

#### **51. DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE**

##### **APPEALS DISMISSED**

(i) **15 Long Royd Drive, Baildon**

**Baildon**

Proposed first floor extension of garage and two storey link extension - Case No: 15/01534/HOU.

Appeal Ref: 15/00122/APPHOU.





(ii) **19 Narrow Lane, Harden, Bingley**

**Bingley Rural**

Demolition of 1 detached bungalow and construction of 2 semi-detached dwellings and associated works - amended 11.8.15 - Case No: 15/02853/FUL.

Appeal Ref: 15/00120/APPFL2.

(iii) **3 Oakdale Avenue, Shipley**

**Windhill and Wrose**

Retrospective application for alterations to porch and bay window - Case No: 15/03137/HOU.

Appeal Ref: 15/00121/APPHOU.

(iv) **Golden Fleece, 38 Long Lane, Harden, Bingley**

**Bingley Rural**

Retrospective application for construction of outbuilding - Case No: 15/00260/FUL.

Appeal Ref: 15/00098/APPFL2.

(v) **High Close, 31 Springfield Road, Keighley**

**Keighley Central**

Construction of detached dwelling - Case No: 15/00858/FUL.

Appeal Ref: 15/00114/APPFL2.

(vi) **Jaytail Farm, Holden Lane, Silsden**

**Craven**

Change of use of 3 agricultural buildings and land to residential use - Case No: 15/00594/PAR.

Appeal Ref: 15/00100/APPNC2.

(vii) **Norr Fold Farm, Coplowe Lane, Wilsden, Bradford**

**Bingley Rural**

Retrospective change of use of agricultural land to garden land - Case No: 15/01673/FUL.

Appeal Ref: 15/00097/APPFL2.

**APPEALS NOTICE VARIED AND UPHELD (ENFORCEMENTS ONLY)**

(viii) **222 Park Lane, Keighley**

**Keighley East**

Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Case No: 11/01117/ENFUNA

Appeal Ref: 15/00083/APPENF

**Resolved –**

**That the decisions be noted.**

**NO ACTION**





Chair

**Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Panel.**

i:\minutes\plks27Jan

THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER

